

## REMARKS

Claims 20-23, 31-33, 53-56, and 64-66 are pending in the application. The Office Action objected to claims 20-23 and 31-33 because of alleged informalities. Specifically, the Office Action states that “[i]n claim 1, line 3 and line 9, ‘a at least one’ and ‘the analog receiver circuitry’ should be ‘at least one’ and ‘the receiver analog circuitry’, respectively.” Office Action at 2. The Office Action further objects to claims 21-23 and 31-33 because they depend on claim 20.

Although the Office Action refers to “claim 1,” the Applicant assumes that the Office Action intends to claim 20 (claim 1 is a canceled claim). The Applicant therefore amends claim 20 according to the suggestion set forth in the Office Actions. The Applicant consequently requests withdrawal of the objection.

The Office Action further rejected claims 20-23, 31-33, 53-56, and 64-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. With respect to claims 22 and 55, the Office Action states that “the second integrated circuit” lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 22 and 55 depend ultimately on claims 20 and 53, respectively. Each of claims 20 and 53 recites a “second integrated-circuit device.” The Applicant with this paper amends claims 22 and 55 to each recite “second integrated-circuit device,” rather than “second integrated circuit.” The Applicant submits that the amended claims have proper antecedent basis for the “second integrated-circuit device.”

With respect to claims 20 and 53, the Office Action states: “Claim 20 and claim 53 recite a control signal configured to have at least a first state and a second state. However, both claims fail to recite in what condition(s) when the control signal is in the second state.” Office Action at 3. The Applicant disagrees with the rejection for at least the following reasons.

First, the cited passage in the Office Action fails to set forth a prima facie indefiniteness rejection. The Office has the burden of making a proper rejection. Here, the entire substantive part of the rejection consists of the following words: “However, both claims fail to recite in what

condition(s) when the control signal is in the second state.” Office Action at 3. The sentence appears grammatically incorrect. The Applicant cannot determine exactly what in claims 20 and 53 deem indefinite.

Nevertheless, the Applicant has made a good-faith effort to decipher the language. Assuming that the Office Actions seeks to say “both claims fail to recite in what condition(s) when the control signal is in the second state,” the Applicant points out that, read properly, the claims are not indefinite. More specifically, as part of an indefiniteness analysis, one must read the claims in light of the description in the specification from the viewpoint of a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Here, the specification includes description of the states of the control signal. The Applicant submits that, when read in light of that description, claims 20 and 53 (and hence the claims that ultimately depend on them) are not indefinite. Should the Office disagree, however, the Applicant requests a detailed discussion and analysis, rather than a conclusory statement regarding the claims’ indefiniteness.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims are allowable. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a prompt Notice of Allowance.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in allowable condition. Consequently, favorable reconsideration and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Applicant does not contemplate that any fees are due in connection with this paper. If any fees are due for any reason, however, please deduct such fees from (or credit any overpayment to) deposit account number 50-3813/SILA-073.

The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number indicated below with any questions or comments, or to otherwise facilitate expeditious and compact prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



---

MAXIMILIAN R. PETERSON  
Registration No. 46,469  
Attorney for Applicant

LAW OFFICES OF MAXIMILIAN R. PETERSON  
P.O. Box 93005  
Austin, Texas 78709-3005  
Phone: 512-382-4404  
Fax: 512-382-4405